

VOLUME 16

NUMBER 7

AUG 26 1975

PRICE 74p



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for July 1975

RESTORATION: OUTLINE OF A STRATEGY *The Editor*

CATASTROPHE IN CATECHETICS *Rev. Robert J. Fox*
Michael Davies

MORE ABOUT PENTECOSTALISM
Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer

A REAL BISHOP SPEAKS

BUDGET FOR A CRISIS *J. M. Jackson*

EMPLOYMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
Colin Clark

"Father Henry Twohig, M.S.C., lecturer at St. Paul's College of Education, Newbold Revel, Rugby, wishes to state categorically that the views on the Resurrection ascribed to him by W. J. Morgan in the April number of *Christian Order* in an article entitled 'The New Gnostic', are in no way in accord with his belief and teaching. He declares categorically that he has always taught and believed that the tomb of Jesus was found to be empty because the corpse of the crucified Jesus was transformed by the power of God into a glorified humanity and that this is the meaning he attributes to the Church's proclamation that 'Christ is risen'. Accordingly, any contrary statement of his beliefs is due to an unfortunate misunderstanding."

We are happy to publish this affirmation on behalf of Father Twohig. We regret sincerely any damage done to his good name through any inadvertence on our part in this matter.

Paul Crane, S.J.,
Christian Order.

Contents

Page

- 386 DESTROYING OUR CHILDREN'S FAITH
The Editor
- 389 CATASTROPHE IN CATECHETICS
1: THE GENERAL PICTURE
Michael Davies
2: THE CANADIAN EXAMPLE
Rev. Robert J. Fox
- 401 EMPLOYMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
Colin Clark
- 407 THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD
5: RESTORATION: OUTLINE OF A STRATEGY
The Editor
- 418 MORE ABOUT PENTECOSTALISM
Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer
- 422 TIME AND THE SECULAR
Henry Edwards
- 433 A REAL BISHOP SPEAKS
DIRECTION TO THE PRIESTS OF THE DIOCESE OF SANDHURST, AUSTRALIA.
- 436 BUDGET FOR A CRISIS
J. M. Jackson
- 443 ANY QUESTIONS
William Lawson, S.J.
- 446 BOOK REVIEWS

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN ORDER, JULY, 1975

Christian Order is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 16

JULY, 1975

NUMBER 7

Destroying Our Children's Faith

THE EDITOR

A RATHER remarkable article in this issue of *Christian Order* by Father Robert J. Fox, a well-known priest-writer in the United States, tells the story of a Canadian Archbishop who examined, in his retirement, a Catechism whose use he had ordered in his archdiocese when actively engaged in governing it; but which, unfortunately, he had not found occasion, at the time, to submit to careful, personal examination. The Archbishop discovered to his consternation that the children of his archdiocese were not being taught Catholic doctrine out of the new Catechism, but a somewhat blatant brand of humanism. As a result, a considerable number of them, in all probability, have by now lost the Faith. Busy with administration and so on, trusting those assigned to catechetical work in his archdiocese, he had not heeded the complaints raised by parents and others against the new Catechism, which was in use not only in his own archdiocese, but in other dioceses of Canada.

The point I would emphasize in this Editorial is that the same thing is happening here. Catechetical manuals and

teaching are not being submitted to rigorous, doctrinal scrutiny before being brought into general use. Meanwhile, the complaints of parents and many good teachers go unheeded.

By way of example, we submit for the inspection of readers the result of a most careful examination to which a new catechetical syllabus—issued with the authority of the Bishop of an English diocese and sent to all parishes—has been submitted by an experienced catechist, absolutely loyal to the magisterium of the Church. The syllabus is intended for children of from 5 to 11 years. The conclusions of our catechist-correspondent, who spent many hours examining this syllabus, are as follows:

“It is well put together and aims rightly at appealing to the children, but the great lack is that of *definite* religious instruction. The exhortations to kindness and unselfishness are excellent, but if children are given nothing more than what this syllabus contains, they will not know the Catholic Faith. These are the defects of the syllabus as I have discovered them:

1. The Creed and Hail Mary are not taught, and the Pater Noster only at a late stage, there is no suggestion that they should be learnt and said regularly.
2. No definite teaching of Redemption, or the need of it . . . No definite teaching of the Mass as a Sacrafice.
3. No explanation of the fact that St. Joseph was the Foster-father of Our Lord.
4. No mention of the Devil.
5. No mention of Angels.
6. Only a cursory reference to the Saints.
7. No teaching of a final judgment, or of the possibility of losing Heaven.
8. No reference to Our Blessed Lord present in the Tabernacles of Catholic Churches, or suggestions that children should pray in church.
9. The Catholic Church is called instead “The People of God” . . . “The People of God gives us the teaching of

Jesus from the Bible" . . . "God's People meet in God's House to share a meal round the table of one Father". "We share the Family meal—and through this food we come into contact with God in a special way". Mass is also compared to a party—(this can only lead to disappointment for most children; they tend to connect parties with balloons and ice-cream.)

10. Everywhere the supernatural is glossed over as much as possible; children are to be told of Our Lord's Human boyhood and His likeness to them, but no mention of His sinlessness, which made Him unlike us.
11. The teacher is told to stress the kindness of Our Lord rather than the miracles He performed.
12. Our Lady is said to have replied, "Yes alright", to the Angel Gabriel. She was chosen for a "special job".
13. No definite teaching on the Assumption of Our Lady.
14. In one lesson, the children are told to pretend that they are St. Joseph, and to write out an announcement of the Birth of JESUS, which he might send to the *Times* nowadays . . . (such an announcement usually reads, 'To (name of Mother) and (name of Father) a son. This seems to imply that to Mary and Joseph, a son, would be the correct answer?
15. Holy Communion . . . "A farewell party" or "get together"; Calvary is not even mentioned.
16. The Crucifixion . . . Jesus had to die so that He could then start to live a new strong everlasting life.
17. A church is described as a room with chairs and a table in the middle for a special kind of meal.
18. The children are not taught to cross themselves or to genuflect."

Our correspondent concludes: "To my mind, a shocking example of modernism, calculated to destroy the Catholic Faith in the children of the Church."

Under the general heading of "Catastrophe in Catechetics" we have pleasure in reproducing here, with an introduction by Michael Davies, an article which first appeared in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* for October, 1974.

Entitled "Catechism in Canada" it is by Father Robert J. Fox, a well known priest-writer in the United States. We are most grateful to the Editor of the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* for permission to reprint an article whose study we recommend very earnestly to all.

Catastrophe in Catechetics

1): *The General Picture*

MICHAEL DAVIES

IN the mid-1960's a movement to renew the teaching of religious education aroused the interest and enthusiasm of thousands of Catholic teachers. Courses were arranged; new methods explained; new text books published of which perhaps the best example was the famous *German Catechism*. It seemed that the principles for which such enlightened catechists as Canon Drinkwater had been campaigning for years might be implemented at last.

By 1970, many of the teachers who had welcomed the catechetical renewal with such initial enthusiasm had rightly come to regard it as a menace to the faith of Catholic children. Letters and articles in the Catholic press not only gave evidence of widespread misgivings but documented the reasons for this change of attitude. The catechetical movement had, in fact, been taken over by proponents of neo-modernism. Fr. George Telford, Vice-Chairman of the

National Council for Catechetics, assessed the situation with great accuracy when he stated in *The Universe* (July 31st, 1970) that "...the catechetical movement now seems to be indissolubly wedded to the 'new' theology, and is begetting children who do not seem much at home in the household of the faith".

It is by no means intended to allege that the many teachers, nuns in particular, who uncritically digested the mish-mash of modernism dished out to them by priests claiming to be "catechetical experts" were all unorthodox themselves. After all, they had been sent to learn from these men by the bishops and the teaching given to them came with the authority of the bishops. The widespread acceptance of the "new" theology certainly indicates that all was far from well in the Church; perhaps the practice of accepting and passing on without criticism anything that came from above had become too ingrained in the Catholic mentality. A very high proportion of these so-called experts have now abandoned their vocations; but they are still looked upon with adulation by large numbers of their former students.

The most severe blow to the "new" catechetical establishment came when Cardinal Heenan dismissed almost the entire staff of its headquarters, Corpus Christi College, London. The type of teaching given there, now being passed on to thousands of Catholic children by its former students, can best be gauged by reading a book entitled *The First Christmas* by Fr. Hubert Richards, its former Principal. Fr. John McKee had no hesitation in describing Fr. Richards as a modernist in the February 1975 issue of *Christian Order*, and yet Fr. Richards is still giving courses to teachers!

Those wishing to read a documented study of the background to the "new" catechetical movement can refer to the *Dossier on Catechetics* which I prepared for Approaches. It came under fierce and abusive attack from the catechetical establishment when first published in 1970. A third edition

(1) *Dossier on Catechetics*; 25p post-free from Approaches, 1, Waverley Place, Saltcoats, Ayrshire, Scotland.

has just been printed, and re-reading it now makes it clear that its principal defect was to understate seriously the case against the "new" catechetics.

The most disquieting aspect of the crisis, which is by no means over, was an almost universal refusal by the bishops to take any steps to protect the faith of our children or, as often as not, to admit that anything was wrong at all. Bishop after bishop insisted that what was happening was that a small number of confused parents were mistaking a change of method for a change of content. The reasons for this are varied and complex. They tended to rely on their experts, and this is what the experts told them. They were genuinely busy, generally with matters of trivial importance compared with the faith of Catholic children; matters involving finance and administration. There was also a matter of protecting their own prestige; to take action against priests they had appointed to important positions would involve the admission of an error of judgment.

In 1973, the *Pro Fide* Movement published an analysis of the more widely used religious text books and syllabuses. (2). This proved beyond doubt how serious the situation was and showed that children whose religious instruction was based upon certain of these text-books would remain almost totally ignorant of the basis of their faith. Parents who do not possess a copy of this document would do well to obtain one as the text-books and syllabuses it analyses are still widely used. It is also valuable as an indication of reliable texts, for some emerged very well from the analysis. A most revealing indication of the state of the situation was provided when one group of parents, alarmed by the analysis, approached their bishop to ask him which syllabus and text-books were being used in his diocese. The bishop replied that he did not know!

In 1974 *Approaches* published a 96-page Dossier de-

(2) *Doctrine in Catechetics*; 10p post-free from Pro Fide Book Service, 39, Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey.

picting the shortcomings of a particular catechetical director. This Dossier was little more than a series of documented facts from one end to the other, any one of which should have secured the immediate dismissal of the priest concerned. The Catholic Teachers' Federation in the archdiocese concerned sent a request to their archbishop asking that this priest should answer the charges contained in the Dossier. The archbishop's only answer was to ignore all the evidence and issue a statement reaffirming his complete confidence in his Catechetical Director. ⁽³⁾

The fact that a good number of the "new" catechists are now *hors de combat* should give no cause for optimism. The state of affairs in many of our schools and, above all in our training colleges, is still alarming. If most of our bishops could actually make the effort to visit these colleges and question the students on their knowledge of basic doctrine they would certainly be horrified at what they discovered. There is now an entire generation of Catholic teachers leaving their colleges unable to teach a faith which they do not even know. It is hardly surprising that it is now the tendency for Catholic teenagers to lapse as soon as they leave school.

The article which follows is of the very greatest importance. It describes what was certainly the traumatic experience of a retired Canadian archbishop who, having some time on his hands, decided to investigate some of the complaints made to him by parents and teachers which he *had been too busy* to investigate while still exercising his office. To his horror, the bishop discovered that all the complaints regarding the "new" catechetics were quite true and he has had the honesty and humility to admit to a serious failure in his pastoral duty. The point which must be stressed is that the deficiencies of the Canadian catechetical programme are almost exactly the deficiencies found in our own "new" catechetics. The same doctrines are ignored or distorted. The same ignorance of the faith is shown by

(3) *The Fort Betrayed*; 15p post-free from *Approaches*.

students subjected to the new teaching. Archbishop Routhier actually took the trouble to meet students and discuss their faith with them: "I have met and discussed with a number of the students of our Catholic schools who have followed our catechists. I cannot but deplore the very limited knowledge of most of them and cannot be surprised that so many have fallen away".

Everyone who is concerned with the faith of young Catholics—and upon their faith rests the future of the Church — should familiarise themselves with the article which follows. They should bring it to the attention of their bishops; they should ask their bishops to follow the example of Archbishop Routhier not *after* they retire, *but now*. Catholics have a right to ask this of their bishops and to point out, respectfully of course, that they cannot possibly have any task which could be considered more urgent.

2: *The Canadian Example*

REV. ROBERT J. FOX

Unlike the United States, our neighbours to the north have had one series of religion texts which has become known as *The Canadian Catechism*. I say *unlike* our country in this sense. We have had no American Catechism. The bishops of the United States have never imposed any individual catechism upon our dioceses. Immediately after Vatican II, however, the Canadian bishops had catechetical manuals drawn up which would be "adapted to the age and psychology of students, and also to bring about the formation of specialized catechists, professors experienced in teaching religion and priests, to work together in adapting the texts. During eight successive years, these men and women prepared eight volumes of catechisms, known as the *Come to the Father* series, for students and grades I to VIII."

According to His Excellency, the Most Rev. Henri Routhier, former Archbishop of Grouard-McLennan, "... most of the Canadian bishops ordered these texts to be

obligatory in their dioceses after the Canadian Catholic Conference had approved them 'in globo,' relying on the competence and orthodoxy as well as the good-will and devotedness of those who had drafted the texts." The recently retired archbishop, quoted in the April 1974 *Our Lady of the Cape* magazine, which honours the Canadian National Marian Shrine, had made a thorough study of the entire *Come to the Father* series. His report was widely appreciated, and according to *Our Lady of the Cape* publishers, it was sent out to his fellow-bishops as a service to the Church of Canada and to the committee chosen to re-evaluate the series. This is what Archbishop Routhier wrote:

"If all the bishops had been able to have personal knowledge of the texts before approving them, it may well be that these texts would have been more doctrinal, more substantial, and we would not have met to the same extent the criticisms and opposition of an increasing number of parents, teachers and members of the clergy."

Bishops Short-Changed

Archbishop Routhier offered a consideration which has often been observed among bishops in other parts of the world including our own United States. "In justice to the bishops, it must be recognized that their responsibilities are extremely heavy, particularly since the Council, and that they are unable to meet all their obligations except with the help of a competent and devoted personnel in whom they must place their trust." This statement, I think, gives evidence that many bishops, and not only in Canada, have been short-changed. It points to the need that while preaching the Word of God is the *primary* duty of bishops, a primary consideration and attention must now be given to catechisms *directly* by the bishops themselves, and not merely trusting evaluative teams and committees. Direct and personal study must be given to whatever series are approved for a diocese, however busy the bishops in fact are, for it concerns the whole future of the Church and the loss of

immortal souls as a consequence, if neglected. No administrative work should take priority to this. One soul is of more value in the eyes of God than the whole created universe. The immortal souls of our children are priceless. They represent future families. Each individual soul lost to the Church may well represent many future souls separated from the fullness of true faith. Archbishop Routhier took the time to make a thorough study of *The Canadian Catechism*. He has set bishops and pastors a remarkable example. He no longer needed to rely upon complaints for deficiencies as they came from pastors, teachers and countless parents. He saw for himself. The humility this archbishop manifested in doing so, and the humility manifested in the *wide acceptance* his report received in calling for a re-evaluation, is worthy of note. It may bring little comfort to parents whose children have been victimized and have fallen away.

Conclusions of an Archbishop

Archbishop Routhier did exactly what this writer has been urging for years. I have asked that our bishops themselves evaluate the series. I have asked that our bishops go into our classrooms and find out for themselves and see if the thousands of parents this writer has heard from were only imagining their complaints. This is what the former Archbishop of Grouard-McLennan wrote: ". . . I have met and discussed with a number of the students of our Catholic schools who have followed our catechesis. I cannot but deplore the very limited knowledge of most of them and cannot be surprised that so many have fallen away. I do not attribute these weaknesses to the actual teaching of religion, but I believe it is in good part due to the insufficiency of the doctrine that has been taught them. One should make sure that those who are charged with giving catechetical instruction understand its supreme importance and apply themselves to it with zeal. The Teachers' Manual should be considerably less voluminous, clear and concise, so that they may find time to prepare their classes."

The following is a very strong, but honest and humble statement, coming from an archbishop after his personal evaluation of a series most of his country's bishops mandated:

"A large number of Christians and undoubtedly many of our youth who have followed our Canadian Catechism are quite ignorant of those truths necessary for salvation both as concerns dogma and morality. They have little conception of the malice and baseness of sin, and hence show no anxiety to avoid sin or to renounce it."

Below are some of the conclusions the above-mentioned archbishop came to: "*The Canadian Catechism* orientates towards a way of life which is more humanistic than Christian because of its lack of doctrine . . . It stresses social relations which the students develop through love, without bringing out the supernatural motives which should animate a Christian. *It is the theological basis which is lacking* throughout most of the Catechism. The Catechism is insufficiently based on revelation, too little importance is attached to original sin, the knowledge of which is essential for the understanding of actual sin, of the Immaculate Conception, of Redemption, of Penance, of the Ten Commandments, of the frailty of man which inclines him to evil."

Lacking in Substance and Content

The archbishop used criteria of evaluation established by a Papal Commission reviewing the Dutch Catechism. He found that an attentive examination of *The Canadian Catechism* brings out that it is far from expressing clearly and in their entirety these essential truths. 1. Creation, including angels and souls. 2. the fall of man and original sin. 3. the perpetual virginity of Mary. 4. Redemption and Satisfaction of Christ. 5. the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Mass. 6. Eucharistic Presence. 7. infallibility of the Church and revealed mysteries. 8. priesthood and Magisterium, dogmatic theology. 9. Trinity and Sacraments. 10. moral theology and the Ten Commandments.

Archbishop Routhier said: "Its principal defects may be summed up: a lack of substance and content. While the children are taught a great deal about kindness and consideration and generosity, mostly on a humanistic level, and while they are led to develop attitudes of reverence and devotion, they are taught little Catholic doctrine. *Nowhere do we find a clear statement that Mass is the Sacrifice of the Cross renewed in a mystical manner on the altar.* It is spoken of as a meal. The attitude of many students would incline us to believe they do not know that Christ is really present in the tabernacle." Methodology takes precedence over content in *The Canadian Catechism*, he indicated.

The Ten Commandments

This is what our reviewing archbishop found about the Ten Commandments: "*The Ten Commandments are barely mentioned once and practically with no explanation; some set them aside as if they were purely negative. It would be easy to bring out their positive character in relation to the great Commandment which is CHARITY. The experiences of many priests in hearing confessions of students brings them to the sad conclusion that, excepting those whose parents supplement the school catechism lessons, they have little or no or a confused idea of morality.* The morals of so many of our youth who are growing up, and even the teachings of some priests, incline us to believe that a very insufficient and even sinful morality has been allowed to infect the minds of many. It is in catechetics that Christians should be guided in acquiring an informed conscience. *The role of the Church in this formation of conscience is practically ignored.*" This writer concludes that with such a lack of moral education it is little wonder students were thought not ready for confession for some years after First Communion.

What Archbishop Routhier discovered is true of many of the series being used in the United States. This writer knows of no series which has been withdrawn from the market in the United States since the appearance of the *General*

Catechetical Directory from Rome and the *Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education* of our U.S. bishops, which document was subsequently approved by Rome. The archbishop seemed pleased with the text of basic Catholic truths as was done by the American bishops and he saw the same as necessary for Canadian bishops. He considered it *urgent*. He called for primary guidance by the *General Catechetical Directory*.

"As our catechism seems seriously deficient both in its content and as an instrument to help teachers and parents instruct their students satisfactorily, it would seem better were other good Catholic manuals to be placed in the hands of students and those charged with instructing them." Such was the general conclusion of the reviewing Canadian archbishop. I particularly appreciated the conclusion which questioned whether "authors have sufficiently realized that children who have been baptized have received the infused theological and moral virtues and are capable of absorbing far more than what is being given them."

There was seen the need for a more methodical use of the Scriptures through Bible History. Presently much of what is presented from the Bible is romanticized. In the Grade VII volume we read: "It is neither certain nor necessary that all that is recorded in the Bible is true," and this with no further distinctions. "Very little explanation is given of Baptism, sanctifying grace. Jesus is presented as an ordinary boy growing up, who later will work wonders, with hardly any reference to his divine nature, to his perfect and infused knowledge from the time of his conception."

Archbishop Routhier called for a careful evaluation and *radical redrafting* of Catechesis in Canada with a spiritual orientation and solid doctrine. He believes it is because of such deficiencies in evidence in modern catechisms that the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy decided to publish the *General Catechetical Directory*. He called for a complete redrafting of the Canadian Catechism.

Invaluable Service Rendered

Long hours were consecrated by Archbishop Routhier in coming to his conclusion whereby he no longer merely accepted labels placed on a religious education series by others. He personally went through the volumes intended for teachers and parents. He found them too detailed and impractical for teachers and parents to work with. The archbishop met with students, parents, priests, teachers, sisters, in coming to his conclusions. He saw it as essential to give students a solid doctrinal base to resist the materialism and sensuality of our society, broadcast through the media of communications, so that they can counteract and refute the doctrinal and moral errors which assail them.

Archbishop Routhier has doubtlessly performed an incalculable service to the Catholic Church in Canada. His words echo the concern, I'm confident, of millions, not only in Canada but in the United States. What a blessing to have these sentiments expressed by an archbishop of the Catholic Church. The archbishop's entire statement appeared in French in the November 1973 *Carrefour Chretien* publication under the direction of the Rev. George H. Dugal. It was titled: "*Considerations sur la Catechese Canadienne*."

Bishop Leo Blais, former Bishop of the St. Paul Diocese in Alberta, came to similar conclusions about the Canadian Catechism. Bishop Blais is now a pastor of a parish on the outskirts of Montreal. He has written a 50-page pamphlet on the shortcomings of the *Come to the Father* series known as *The Canadian Catechism* in the provinces of our northern neighbours.

The document of our American bishops, "*Basic Teachings For Catholic Religious Education*," approved by the Vatican and praised by Archbishop Routhier is indeed praiseworthy. However, while we look forward hopefully to the development of the *National Catechetical Directory*, we fail to see any serious implementation on a wide scale of the *General Catechetical Directory* and the *Basic Teachings* documents in the United States. What we have seen, as

proclaimed in advertisements, especially for high school series in the summer of '73 and published in the '73-'74 school year, were *promises* of implementation of the *General Catechetical Directory* and the *Basic Teachings* documents. A study of the actual series as they came from the publishers week by week were rather *contrary* to these documents. Not only were their *promises* unfulfilled, but there was greater evidence of Modernism and process theology type of thinking than before.

Place no Trust in Labels

Unfortunately, we still have in the United States pastors and religious education co-ordinators who trust labels and advertisements. They do not study the texts or series in any depth. They may glance casually through a few issues or pages of texts. In the meantime our youth are being educated out of the Church while false doctrines are promoted about the teaching-believing Church in the minds of our Catholic students. One series advertised at great length this past summer, which claimed to implement the Church's official documents on religious education, exposed the students to thinking which told them that they had the Holy Spirit just as much as the hierarchy and that the infallibility of students in the believing Church was just as valid as the infallibility of the teaching Church. They should only consider the "opinions" of the teaching Church and form their own conclusions as to what were valid Christian life styles.

While we in the United States can thank God that no one catechism series was mandated for all our dioceses, we can learn a valuable lesson from our neighbours to the north who are now seriously evaluating what was mandated for most of their dioceses. It appears that no pastor or bishop can afford to have "middle management" make decisions for what is his primary duty—the teaching of authentic Catholic faith.

In the following article, Dr. Clark discusses a critical employment situation and what can be done about it.

Employment in Developing Countries

COLIN CLARK

NO information except the vaguest approximations is available on the extent of unemployment in the developing countries, nor is any such information likely to be available for some time to come, until the statistical services of these countries are greatly improved. What we do know is that it is very serious, and in some cases getting worse. With the food problem now on the way towards solution, employment is now becoming these countries' most urgent problem (with education closely rivalling it in urgency).

The farmers and their families do not expect to work the absolutely regular hours of the industrial worker, even in Australia. Weather, markets and other considerations have them working all-out at some periods, and enjoying a rest at other times.

In many parts of Asia, this situation is greatly accentuated by the shortness of the monsoonal season, in which most of the cultivation and planting has to be done. The family may be idle for many months in the year; but they have to remain on the farm to get the work done on the farm in the busy season. It is true that the production programme, even on small farms, can be diversified to make labour requirements more uniform throughout the year, as Japanese experience has shown. But this calls for greatly increased technical knowledge and education, and some capital expenditure.

Extended Families

Urban unemployment, on the other hand, cannot be blamed on the climate. There is no government unemployment insurance. The unemployed are supported by their relatives, under the Asian extended family system, at near-subsistence level. When things become too bad, they return to the still greater poverty of the villages which they had left. There is also much "disguised unemployment" in the form of street sellers of lottery tickets, retailers with very few customers, etc.

What can the Governments of developing countries do to provide more urban employment? More steel works and other show pieces are certainly not the answer. Even when these are economically justified, the employment which they provide is minute in proportion to the whole urban population. Most urban employment in the developing countries is, and will continue for some time to be, not in what we could call "industry" at all, but in handicraft and small scale production, building, transport, service industries, etc. What can be done to increase the total employment offered by these industries? The answer is quite unexpected—increase agricultural productivity.

The connection between agricultural productivity and urban employment in low-income and developing countries, while it was foreshadowed by Ricardo in the early 19th century, was first stated (it appears) by M. R. Haswell and the present writer in *The Economics of Subsistence Agriculture* in 1964. It was stated as a practical conclusion based on observation of the evidence from all available developing countries, though there are also theoretical reasons for it.

Food Substitutes

The development of a country's agricultural productivity must be considered in conjunction with what are best called "food-substitutes". If a country, for instance, discovers oil—which all developing countries would like to do—this can

be exported, and some of the proceeds used to buy food. This has the same economic effect as an increase in the country's own agricultural productivity. The same consideration applies to countries which can produce exportable supplies of other minerals, or of forest products, and, in a few cases, exports of manufactured goods.¹

Why should improvements in agricultural productivity contribute to a rise in urban employment? The principal reason is that, without improved agricultural productivity, a country cannot feed an expanding urban labour force. It is surprising that such an obvious consideration is so universally neglected by "economic planners"—probably because of their profound bias against agriculture. Agricultural requirements are all the greater because of the fact that urban workers almost universally eat more expensive foods than the rural population. The reasons for this probably lie in the sociology of "demonstration effects" rather than in economics. But their demands have to be met none the less.

Trade

Another reason why improved agricultural productivity is a necessary condition for expanding urban employment is that this latter creates greatly increased requirements for international trade. Even if the country's industrialization programme is based on producing textiles, steel or other goods formerly imported, experience has shown that requirements for equipment, components, etc., increase, leaving the country in the end needing to import substantially more than before. (Our own Australian experience should have told us this.) Most economic planners have a prejudice against international trade, of which they can only control the import side, being unable to plan exports just by saying so. In the case of most developing countries, increased exports to pay

¹ The relationship is semi-logarithmic. The numbers in non-agricultural employment, as a proportion of the whole population, are a linear function of the logarithm of agricultural product (plus "food-substitutes" specified above) per head of the agricultural population.

for the imports required by the urban population can only be in the form of agricultural products, adverse though the world markets for agricultural products may be.

Consequences

If a country tries to increase urban employment while neglecting these obvious requirements, as India has done, what are the consequences? Attempts at increasing urban employment without increasing agricultural productivity sufficiently to feed the urban workers properly, or to provide the additional exports which it calls for, lead to very high food prices for the urban population on the one hand, and a permanent balance of payments crisis on the other. Through a process of near-starvation, the high food prices drive many of the unemployed and half-employed back to the villages.

Not only must an increase in agricultural productivity be obtained. It must be passed on to consumers in the form of lower food prices. Farmers—and still more landowners who are the ultimate beneficiaries from high food prices—will resent this. Before long we shall be getting demands that governments legislate for “fair” prices for farm products. These demands must be resisted at all costs. If the present high prices continue, so will underemployment and near-starvation. Land owners, large and small, have done far too well out of recent food shortages—and, in most cases, have not paid their share of taxation either. It is the unemployed and the rural poor, the landless families who have to purchase their food, who should have our consideration.

In 1952, I prepared an economic report for Pakistan. Their most urgent need, I pointed out, was to increase urban employment. (I added that a substantial share of whatever increased urban employment was possible should be diverted to the Eastern Province, otherwise there would be serious trouble; this warning was completely ignored.)

On the evidence available at that time, it was doubted whether any country could increase its urban employment

at the rate of more than 4 per cent per year. If, initially, urban employment occupied only 25 per cent of the labour force, this would mean that the maximum possible increase in urban employment would look after an increase of 1 per cent per annum in the total labour force. With population growth raising the labour force by 2 per cent per annum or more, this would mean that most of the increasing number of workers would still have to find employment in agriculture for many years into the future, until the 4 per cent per annum compound interest rate growth in urban employment eventually enabled it to overtake agricultural employment.

South Korea

Recent experience in South Korea, however, has shown that, under favourable circumstances, urban employment can be increased by as much as 8 per cent per year. South Korea has not only substantially raised its agricultural productivity, but also produced substantial "food-substitutes" in the form of manufactured exports. A country which can attain anything like this rate of growth will soon solve its unemployment problem.

Instead of urban employment, can anything be done to promote "rural employment" in the developing countries? The phrase is ambiguous. We must distinguish between agricultural employment and non-agricultural rural occupations. Many developing countries have substantial reserves of cultivable land still unused. In Asia, this category includes Indonesia (in the Outer Islands), Malaysia, the Philippines, Burma and Ceylon. The problem in their case is to provide roads, harbours, water supply and other infra-structure necessary for the settlement of new land, which calls for considerable capital expenditure, as well as some social disturbance.

In a minority of countries, increased agricultural employment can only be made possible by further sub-dividing existing farms, or employing more men on each farm. However the experience of Japan, still more of Taiwan, shows how an adequate though not a generous livelihood can be

earned on extremely small farms by an educated rural population with sufficient skill in management.

Non-agricultural rural employment in the form of handicrafts, or "cottage industries", as they are known in India, does not offer much encouragement. There is considerable employment of this nature in Indonesia, but the returns are extremely low, even by that country's standards. In Malaysia where wages and farm incomes are higher, only the extremely poor will undertake rural handicrafts. In spite of heavy preferences and subsidization, the Indian "cottage industries" programme has been, on the whole, unsuccessful

Sub-Contracting

It is a different matter however with the sub-contracting of industrial work to farm families. In this, as in some other matters, Japan has shown a way which other Asian countries should follow. Japanese industrial employers in recent years have been increasingly driven by acute labour shortages to promote such sub-contracting. This has enabled many of the poorer farm families to fill in the winter gaps in their farm employment programme. It has slowed down the depopulation of Japanese villages, which is taking place under the attraction of high and rapidly rising urban wages.

The decentralization of large-scale industrial processes to moderately sized provincial towns is however quite another matter. Such decentralization was the industrial policy proposed for India by Gandhi (he explained it to me in a personal interview a few weeks before he was murdered). Gandhi viewed with great alarm the prospect of the growth of huge industrial cities such as Bombay and Calcutta. Detailed studies at the Gokhale Institute have found that this policy would be far cheaper economically, in addition to the social advantages which Gandhi saw so clearly. Gandhi's successors, while venerating his name, have completely ignored his advice in this, as in many other matters.

In this last of a series of five articles on "The Church and the World" Father Crane discusses ways and means of developing the counter-attack against neo-Modernism that has already begun.

CURRENT COMMENT

The Church and the World

5: Restoration: Outline of a Strategy

THE EDITOR

AT the end of last month's article, I noticed a growing awareness on the part of the laity of the dangers at present encompassing the Church. In most cases—and very understandably—this amounts to no more than a feeling that something is very wrong and that there is something that can only be described as phoney about present efforts at renewal, particularly as experienced at parish level by so many in the Church. The laity, thank God, are now past the stage where they can be soothed with soft words. Talk about changes in the Church since Vatican II being the work of the Holy Spirit tend increasingly to leave them cold. And rightly so. The value of the changes can be gauged, surely, by their fruits and, so far as I can see, these are heavily on the debit side—where the Church as a whole is concerned, 25,000 priests have defected, thousands of Religious have abandoned their vocations whilst, of the thousands who remain, many have secularized their lives to the point where they do more harm than good by remaining in religious life. Under such circumstances one would expect seminaries to be as empty as, in fact, they are and vocations to religious life to be at an all-time low. Attendance at Mass is dropping and, in addition to those who have ceased to practise their religion because their faith has gone, others have abandoned

it in disgust and gone from the Church with tears in their eyes: the pusillanimity of Authority in face of the contemporary confusion has reduced them to the point where, I am afraid, the Church is no longer credible where they are concerned. Meanwhile, the faith of thousands of Catholic children is being relentlessly destroyed through the New Catechetics and that of the Faithful as a whole through the increasing desacralization of the liturgy.

Failure of Ecclesiastical Authority

The Faithful are not fools and they have been taking note of this decline, especially as it affects their children, for some time. They have noted with increasing concern, to put it mildly, and with growing dismay, that ecclesiastical authority, whether it be that of parish priest or bishop, has, for the most part, left their requests and their complaints unanswered, appearing almost totally impotent in face of pressures exercised by an unrepresentative and progressive minority. It is, I think, not too much to say that, where this country is concerned, episcopal authority is reaching a point where it is now scarcely credible and that, where the Church as a whole is concerned—I say this with the greatest sadness—the same may well soon apply to Rome itself. I hate saying this; but I have to say it—in no mood of disobedience to Authority, but simply and solely because I believe it to be true. And I have to add that, worse still than this growing lack of trust in the government of the Church at all levels, even, I fear, that of the Roman Curia, is the apparent non-realization of that government, again at all levels, that this lack of trust not only exists, but appears increasingly justified because the post-conciliar policies, which have bred it in every field, having proved, in fact, so disastrously futile, continue to go increasingly unrecognized as such by appropriate authority within the Church. This is the shattering thing—the apparent non-realization by the top, at all levels within the Church, of the spiritual carnage wrought amongst the Faithful, victimized as they have been,

by a progressive minority and, as it appears, abandoned in the process by ecclesiastical authority.

Determination of the Laity

Despite this, however, there is more than a glimmer of hope when one realises that, where so many of the Faithful are concerned, initial dismay has given way to a stubborn determination—which should not be thought of as revolt and which is, in fact, an expression of deepest loyalty to the Church—that, despite episcopal and clerical failure on a scale not seen perhaps since the days of Athanasius and the Arian heresy, they will not give way to what is becoming increasingly a new religion. They will, rather, have the old one back; that is, they will defend the real as distinct from what many of them think of now as the phoney Church. This is the mood and it is the right mood; the mood of the English and Welsh Martyrs, of the Cornishmen who rose against the new Prayer Book, of Robert Aske and the Pilgrimage of Grace. The task now is to make it articulate and give it effective expression. It is to this that we shall address ourselves in the remainder of this article.

Twofold Task

The task, I would suggest, is twofold. Two parallel lines of action are called for, which are of equal importance, which may well overlap from time to time; but which, very reasonably, can be kept distinct in this article for the purpose of clear and effective analysis. What is needed is the creation of a climate of opinion in support of what I will call the True Faith and against the new secularized and vulgarized version, which is being passed off far too often as a substitute for it. This represents one line of vitally necessary action. The other line of action is to be found in the strategic exercise of anti-progressive and anti-secularist pressure at the key-points which exist at all levels within the Church. Let us analyze these lines of action now and let us begin

with the creation of a climate of opinion that effectively counters the secularist and neo-modernist trends at present rampant within the Church. Analysis in this article will be confined to the United Kingdom. Readers elsewhere can make similar application to their own countries.

Forming a Climate of Opinion

The first thing to notice here—and it gives legitimate grounds for satisfaction—is that the process has already begun. The climate of opinion in opposition to secularist trends within the Church has already been created; what it needs is further development. I refer, in the first place, to the very great contributions made in the field of organization, if I may put it that way, by Approaches, Pro Fide and the Latin Mass Society, all three of them essentially lay efforts. At the very least and apart from their exercise of pressure against progressive control of nerve-centres within the Church, which will be considered later, Pro Fide and Approaches have served well and devotedly as focal points for those who would band together in defence of the Faith: their very existence has served notice on the Progressives that they are not going to have the field to themselves, and the effect of this alone has been much more profound than most people realise. More than this, the Review published by Approaches, which bears its name, the admirable book-service of both of them, the pamphlet-publications in the catechetical and educational fields, particularly, which both provide, the discussions at university-chaplaincy level inaugurated by Pro Fide, the admirable study-days which Approaches runs so well and the open meetings which both organize from time to time, have all served to create within the Catholic body a climate of opinion increasingly wary of progressive overtures and desacralizing tendencies and in strong resistance to both. If numbers are anything to go by, the very large attendance at two Pro Fide meetings during past months—in London and Lancashire respectively—may well be a sign of better things to come. Meanwhile, the

Latin Mass Society—quietly, persistently, always with dignity and in a spirit of total loyalty to the Holy See—has held to its invaluable task of upholding the Old Mass, not as a relic, but as a living, vital thing from which the Church can never be severed for long without disintegration and decay. I feel very sure myself that, if readers of *Christian Order* in this country gave their support to these three admirable organizations and, where and when possible, actively organized meetings and Masses in accordance with the guidelines they provide, then the climate of Catholic opinion in this country would be well on the way to setting in full motion that swing in the direction of the Old Faith that is already in process. The addresses of these three organizations will be found on the inside and outside of the back cover of this issue of *Christian Order*. Support for the three of them, even though necessarily passive on the part of many, is of the utmost importance, I think, at the present time when reaction to ten years of neo-modernist depredation within the Church is growing steadily stronger. The thing now is to give it still stronger thrust.

Periodicals and Papers

Still on this point of the development of an effective climate of opinion, one notes the part played so far in this process by *Approaches* (the Review as distinct from the Organization which I have been talking about above), *Faith*, *The Keys of Peter*, the *Newsletter of the International Catholic Priests' Association*, Father Francis Ripley's *Notes of his Association of St. Peter*, the *Broadsheet of the Cell Movement* whose members are doing such splendid work in the field of what might be called public morals and, I think I can say without arrogance, *Christian Order*. Together these constitute an increasingly effective force whose aim is, through thrustful attack on the "faith" and practices of Secularists and neo-Modernists within the Church, coupled with clear explanation of the True Faith, to create a climate of opinion utterly and proudly loyal to the Holy Father

and the teaching authority of the Church. This loyalty, it should be stressed, is *entirely compatible* with reasoned, informed and moderately presented criticism of episcopal and, indeed, Vatican *policies* and *practice* when occasion appears to call for this kind of distasteful proceeding. Loyalty to the Holy See is not to be identified with the sycophancy of an old-time courtier approach.

The impact exercised by the Reviews noted above is most certainly growing. Of this there can be no doubt. Moreover—if my own experience as Editor of *Christian Order* is shared by others—the same applies to their circulation. In illustration, I would remind readers that, in December 1973, *Christian Order* sold out at 4,300 copies. In March of this year, 1975, the total was 7,200—an increase of approximately 44 per cent in 15 months. There are grounds for hope here and they become stronger when one realises that almost the entire increase is in the shape of personal subscriptions, that it has been secured without aid of formal advertisement, but almost entirely through the zeal of readers. Finally, the growing popularity of traditionalist periodicals (as we may call them) in this country stands in sharp contrast with its weekly Catholic Press and other periodicals whose ill-disguised attempts to run with the neo-Modernist tide (or even to remain neutral in the present struggle) has led to a gathering decline in their circulation. It would not, of course, be fair to quote figures here, but even the little one knows in this matter allows the forecast that their future may well appear very soon as increasingly uncertain. There can be no doubt but that the Catholic Body in this country—with reason, to my way of thinking—is becoming more and more disgusted with them: their failure has been very nearly total.

Growing Pamphlet Literature

Supporting this effort on the part of the traditionalist Press and required increasingly by the present failure of the Catholic Truth Society to supply this deficiency, there is

great need that a pamphlet literature of the type already built up by *Approaches*, *Faith* and others should be extended and used not only in support of the periodicals listed above, but to serve the needs of that anti-progressive élite whose effective action it is so necessary to build up as, perhaps, the most effective element in countering the propaganda of the Progressives and restoring confidence and courage to the hearts of the Faithful. This growing pamphlet-literature deserves and will receive, I know, increasing support from the many fine priests and religious who are heart and soul with the counter-attack and who will allow its sale at their church doors and in their schools. They can contribute very greatly indeed to the cause if they do this and, indeed, refuse, at the same time, to allow the sale of any literature of any kind which propagates any kind of doctrine or practice contrary to the Faith. This latter suggestion will sound mean and, indeed, spiteful only to those who think, quite wrongly I am afraid, of the present struggle within the Church as lying between "Left" and "Right" or "Conservative" and "Progressive", as they would put it. This is a nonsense and I say this, even though, for the sake of clarity, I have myself employed these terms in this article. So, too, is the implication that each "side" in the present struggle is possessed of some truth and, so, let the best man win. The whole point of the present struggle is missed by those who think so superficially in these terms. The point is this—the present struggle is deadly because it is essentially between those who see the Church's mission essentially in spiritual terms and those who—seeking to make it acceptable to "modern man"—would secularize it and subjectivize it to the point where nothing is left. This is the nub of the conflict and it is this that a *Times* leader missed and missed badly last Easter Saturday when it saw the present struggle within the Catholic Church merely as a matter of emphasis. It is nothing of the sort. It is far more than this. It is a life-and-death struggle between the secular and the spiritual; one in which there can be no quarter. This is the vital point and no talk about "pluralism" or of a "middle road" should be allowed to cloud its sig-

nificance. I would suggest, therefore, that priests—especially, perhaps, those who read this Review—should keep this in mind when they inspect their pamphlet-racks and the Catholic papers at the back of their churches. It could be that a clean sweep is in order here. If it is, they should have no compunction at all about making it. True charity, in fact, demands that they do the necessary without delay.

Action against neo-Modernist Nerve Centres

Now for the second requirement—the parallel line of action against nerve-centres of neo-Modernism at all levels within the Church that should accompany the steady build-up in this country of an anti-progressive climate of opinion. At the moment, I am afraid, the Church in this country and elsewhere is infected to the point where scope for this kind of operation is virtually unlimited. The reason for this is clear. The nerve centres, since the Council, have been and still remain virtually in neo-Modernist hands. The task of the counter-attack is to counter neo-Modernism at these key points and, in the end, destroy it. This is a rough process and an unpleasant one because it concerns persons and personal relationships; but it has to be done because truth is at stake. This is the overriding consideration and we should not be deterred from necessary action by false notions with regard to charity. Where truth is at stake, true charity demands the defence of the Faithful against those who would infect them with error either directly or by unloading on them a line, say, of liturgical practice calculated, wittingly or unwittingly, to erode the Faith of their Fathers. Where and when this kind of situation obtains action must be taken. It must be temperate, indeed, but never soft; and those who undertake it must be no respecters of persons. Examples spring immediately to mind at the level I am about to consider, which is that, really, of the parish and the school. I do this deliberately. Too often, when we talk of nerve-centres, we have in mind action at a level that is well beyond us and fall, in consequence, into the trap of neglecting the

kind of action which awaits us on our own doorstep and which we alone can do. How many, for example realise that, in answering the call to involve themselves in the Third World, they may well be leaving their own parish at home wide open to neo-modernist attack. None of which means that the Third World should be neglected; only that we should retain a sound sense of proportion. Examples, I think, will not be out of place.

Parish and School

The priest, for instance, who plays the buffoon at the altar and turns the New Mass into a picnic or denies the Real Presence from the pulpit, as some have done, must be confronted. What this means in practice is that one or two in the parish must take the lead in this matter; make sure of their facts; judge them against the doctrine of their Faith as set out in, say, Pope Paul's *Credo of the People of God* or the *Penny Catechism*; inform others of the true situation and then act. They must demand to be heard and they must persist in this demand. In the end they will be, provided they have the courage and the determination that persists to the end. The same line of action applies to parents the faith of whose children is being perverted during Religious Instruction at school, whether it be at primary or secondary level. If parents are serious in this matter, it will not take them long to find out what is going on. When they know, they must band together and they must act; and they must never take "no" for an answer. Certainly they must withdraw their children from religious-instruction period as soon as they discover that during it their faith is being eroded. The same line of action, which requires much courage of the sort that prayer will bring, is recommended for students in Catholic Teacher Training Colleges, Catechetical Centres, Catholic Societies in Universities, Seminaries and, indeed, Houses of Study of Religious Orders and Congregations. It is intolerable that, in all of these at present, an irresponsible, neo-modernist minority should teach a line

of doctrine and enforce practices inimical to the Faith and that, for the most part, those in charge should do little or nothing to stop it. The only answer I can see, in default of right action by appropriate authority, is for a brave one or two having made sure of their facts, alerted others of like mind and put their troubles before Our Lord and His Mother in very earnest prayer—to confront the destroyers and/or take the matter to those in authority over them, as the case may be. And they must continue to do this and keep at this no matter how many times they are turned away. In the end—if their staying power is good, their prayer strong and their following loyal and persevering—they will win through. In all this, *the* essential requirement should be noted most carefully—it is always for *one* parishioner in a parish, *one* Catholic student in a university Catholic society, *one* sixth-former at a school, *one* Sister in a convent, priest in a deanery or diocese, seminarian in a seminary, religious in a house of his Order, bishop in a National Conference of Bishops; *one*, everywhere and in all situations, who is able and willing, to do what is necessary and that is *to stand*; not to drift with the progressive tide like so many dead fish in the Catholic Church today, but to swim against it as only a live fish can do. And by “able” in this context I mean possessed of the facts that concern the point at issue or with the ability to get them: by “willing” I have in mind one who is possessed of the prayerful courage necessary to face not only the initial encounter but, in all likelihood, the ensuing ostracism which comes for a time to those who have the courage to act in such a matter. Certainly, means can be found of assisting those who are ready to take brave action along these lines. I think I can say here that, if they write to me, I will see to it that their letters get into the hands of those who will assist them.

The Positive Side

All this, you might say, is negative. It is, of course, and it is nonetheless valuable and necessary for that. But there

is, as a matter of fact, a positive side, which can run parallel with the vital, yet negative activity already outlined. I would like to see in every parish of this country very strong pressure applied by a parish group not only *against* liturgical extravaganza, but *for* a Latin Mass on Sundays, the restoration of Benediction, Stations of the Cross during Lent, First Friday Devotions, May Devotions, the October Rosary, Corpus Christi Processions and so on. Why should we allow these to be taken from us? The Council never banned them. Why not ask—in fact, press—for them back? If all priests who read *Christian Order*—and there are many—reintroduced them into their parishes, the effect, in this country at least, would be quite extraordinary. We would pass almost at a stroke from present doldrums to new-found hope.

High-powered Pressure

And finally—still on this question of pressure—it is clear that a more concerted and high-powered effort than can be thrown up in the instances I have mentioned, is often necessary. Here, for example, I am thinking of the very able thrust, inaugurated by Pro Fide, that demolished the old Corpus Christi College. This is excellent. So, too, is the work done by the Pro Fide Teachers' Group. But the time has come now for more—an intensification of high-powered pressure in the fields particularly of Catechetics and Education and the development of further pressures, similarly powered and organized, in the fields of ecumenism, justice and peace and other areas covered by our present clutter of wasteful and peculiar National Commissions. I feel very sure that Pro Fide, with the right kind of increased support, will do the necessary in these fields to the very great advantage of us all. I would ask priests, who think as I do, and who have the knowledge and time that could help so much here, to offer their services to its Secretary without delay.

We are indebted to *Twin Circle* (3/1/'75) for permission to reproduce this percipient and witty article by Archbishop Dwyer, formerly of Portland, Oregon, U.S.A. It serves as a neat follow-up to two articles published on the same subject last month.

More About Pentecostalism

ARCHBISHOP ROBERT J. DWYER

WHERE was the Holy Spirit between, say, the year 313 A.D., date of the Edict of Milan, and the year 1850, give or take a decade or two either way? If our reckoning is correct that mounts up to a stretch of well over 15 centuries, more than three quarters of the Christian era up to the present. For, according to approved Pentecostal theologizing, the Holy Spirit actually gave up on the Church during all that time.

Our reference, among others (it is implicit in the whole body of recent Charismatic literature), is to the several volumes authored by that industrious team, Mr. and Ms. Kevin Ranaghan, whose credentials as authentic interpreters of the phenomenon would seem to be amply vouched for by their inclusion as "experts" by Cardinal Leo-Joseph Suenens of Brussels in his recently commissioned apologia for Pentecostalism in the contemporary Catholic Church.

Rationale

Here we are introduced to the following reconstruction or rationale of Salvation History: For approximately the first three centuries of the Church the Holy Spirit was indeed active in the Mystical Body, in her trials and tribulations, in her persecutions and martyrdoms.

Prophets read the scroll of the future; those blessed with special charismatic gifts raised their voices in tongues or gave

forth in psalms, hymns and spiritual canticles; healings and cures were effected wholesale; the ranks of martyrs and confessors of holy virgins and widows, were counted by the legion. But then, alas, came the Constantinian Peace: persecution came to a halt and the Church was recognised by the Roman Empire.

Nineteenth Century

For the proverbial mess of pottage, the Pentecostals claim, the Church sold her soul to Caesar. However reluctantly, the Holy Spirit gave up in discouragement, washed his hands of the affair, and withdrew to the bosom of the Trinity.

Nor was he to return, according to this extraordinary reading of the divine economy, until the middle of the nineteenth century, when he finally vouchsafed to descend in power and strength, equal to the First Pentecost, upon certain disaffected Protestant ministers, former Baptists or Methodists, who later formed themselves as Pentecostals, into a loose association known as the Disciples of Christ.

Once again the charisms were poured forth, once again hands were laid on in the Baptism of the Spirit, once again inspired souls spoke in tongues and performed miracles of healing, even to the taking up of serpents. This last, however, only too often proved disastrous, due to the malicious non-cooperation of vipers and rattlesnakes, recreant to their role.

So matters drifted on until the early days of January, 1967, when two Catholic lay members of the religion faculty of Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., an institution, appropriately enough, under the direction of the Holy Ghost Fathers, came to the dismal conclusion that something vital was lacking in their Catholicity.

They were moved to seek the Baptism of the Spirit. This they did, oddly enough, not by going to their authorized spiritual leader, Bishop (now Cardinal) John Wright, and checking on the validity of their Confirmation, but rather to a local Protestant Pentecostal group.

Report

After testing their fitness, hands were laid on them by the delighted charismatics, and the pair promptly broke out in the familiar glossolalia. The day of reconciliation of the Holy Spirit with the Catholic Church had come: the Spirit, after an absence of a millenium and a half, had made up his mind to come back to the Bride of Christ and give her another chance.

From that date on the history of the Catholic Charismatic movement is broadly known: its rapid, even wildfire spread throughout the country, the establishment of a centre or foothold at the University of Notre Dame, where its gathering last summer attracted some 20,000 devotees, the blessing given it by a number of American bishops and priests, the prestigious patronage of Cardinal Suenens (one wonders from whom he received the Baptism of the Spirit), and most recently the sympathetic report on the movement offered by the Committee on Pastoral Ministry of the American hierarchy, meeting in Washington in November of this year (1974).

Happily, the report was withdrawn without action by the body.

What is one to make of all this? Is it conceivable that the Holy Spirit, 1,500 years ago, went off in some kind of a huff and was only induced to return to a group of American Protestant ministers (worthy men, no doubt; we in no way reflect on their honesty or personal holiness) half way through the 19th century? Is this in any way consistent with Christ's explicit promise to remain with his Church all days; even to the consummation of the world? Is it credible that the Church could go on, century after century, through good days and bad, through triumph and tragedy, still somehow the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Body of Christ, and yet be deprived of the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit?

The Duke of Wellington was once accosted by a stranger who greeted him, "Mr. Jones, I believe?" The answer shot

back, "If you believe that, you will believe anything." For this, we submit, with all reverence for those unsuspectingly involved in the movement, men and women of good will, bishops, priests, and religious, is nonsense. Dangerous nonsense.

'Betrayal'

For one thing, it is simply a repetition, with hardly the transposition of a date, of a well-worn Protestant reconstruction of Church history. According to this, the Great Apostasy, the Great Betrayal, occurred early in the fourth century, when the Church Primitive gave way to the Church Imperial, when the age of martyrs shifted into the age of politician popes and bishops, the age of Caesaro-Papism.

This Protestant (or Fundamentalist) analysis goes on to say that not only did the Holy Spirit abandon the Church, but that Christ Himself repented of His promises and withdrew His divine sanction from so unworthy a body.

Somehow, nevertheless, the Christian Church floundered along in ignorance and corruption, until, in the 16th, the 17th, the 18th, or the 19th century, depending on which splinter Protestant sect is talking, the Covenant was renewed with the coming of a Luther, a Calvin, a George Fox, an Emmanuel Swedenborg, a Joseph Smith, and the Holy Spirit came down again to resume His dwelling with His people, full of sweetness and light.

The Catholic Charismatic movement, thus, in our view (and we have considered the matter for a long time with close attention to the facts and principles involved) is nothing more than a repeat performance of a pretty well jaded Protestant thesis. In no sense is it original, either in its attempt to invent its historical justification or in the quality of the alleged instances of divine power at work.

It is characteristic of the secular that it should be the prisoner of time. This accounts for the hollowness to be found in the outpourings of so many progressive theologians today. They have lost that sense of eternity which is essential to religion and which alone can light our world.

Time and the Secular

HENRY EDWARDS

ABOUT once a year (rather like making my Easter duties) I read *The Napoleon of Notting Hill*, a great little book by Chesterton, which converted me to nationalism. I have just finished reading it again as one of the merrier joys of Lent, and find myself impressed once again with the inimitable preface which begins: "The human race to which so many of my readers belong . . ." The theme of this preface is that when G.K.C. looked about him, he saw a number of prophets who each tried to improve upon another of his own class. There was H. G. Wells, for example, who prophesied that the coming world would see an increasing neatness and order; his disciple, Phipps, went a trifle mad when he began cutting down branches of trees to make each side equal. In my own youth there was a prophet of a very different sort, Oswald Spengler, who held that, if a civilisation went on developing, it would at last die. Probably because I was a Christian, I escaped the temptations of the sanguine and the gloomy. But probably because I was a Christian, I began to doubt all the secular prophets. I did not then think that I would live to see the day when the Catholic Church was infected with their spirit.

Irrational Veneration for Time

I believe that an irrational veneration for time corrupts our secular culture. Secularism is by definition time-locked, I mean my words to be taken strictly. The sphere of the secular is untouched by religion. If there be any penetration, the secular ceases to be purely secular. Secularism is time-locked in that it accepts time as a determinative dimension. As such it cannot make an attempt to overlook the temporal. It cannot take eternity into account. I believe that it follows that secularism, when self-confident, believes in progress, a kind of progress, that is, which is unrelated to the past and hardly related to the present. The really secular mind looks out upon an imperfect society, not because of the Fall of Man (the view of a Christian), but because everything is keyed to an all-important future.

The breakdown in this confidence is signified by a doubt about a deterministic, necessary progress. The breakdown may not be brought about by the acceptance of a religion; but it is accompanied when articulate by a bothering about the significance of time. We see it in Joyce's *Ulysses*, Eliot's *The Waste Land* and *Four Quartets*. At a less profound level there is Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *1984*, where Time the Great Healer is dethroned and Time the Raper is in control.

Gospel not Time-Locked

If this be true, there is an inverse relationship between secular self-confidence and religious insight of the sort which the Christian gospel provides. The Gospel is not time-locked. Its spiritual and moral disciplines are designed to deflect the Christian from being over-anxious about tomorrow or next month or next year or 2974. As understood by the secularist time is a limiting rather than a liberating dimension. The passage of time, as secularly conceived, cuts a man off from the past, whereas the Christian is constantly engaged in acts like worship and prayer in which he is one with souls of centuries ago. Catholic Christians and our separated brethren

of the Orthodox community should understand this very well. In perhaps a lesser degree Evangelical Protestants understand it because they wish to conserve what they believe to be the faith once delivered to the saints, and because they have not been tempted by possible worlds. The Christians who have yielded in some degree to the secularist temptation are, as we would expect, the liberals and modernists within the rather amorphous Protestant constituency. Alas, a large number of Catholics, some of whom are described as "leading", have succumbed. The obvious example is de Chardin. Another is the Catholic Information Office to the extent that it has published *The Church 2000*. (I must pay due respect here to Mr. Michael Davies for his incisive and sound Catholic criticism of that extraordinary opus; see *Christian Order*, March 1974.)

"Cambridge" Sub-Theology

Perhaps the most clearly stated pronouncement of liberal Christianity in this respect comes from the pen of Dr. Vidler in his introduction to *Soundings*. I give this as an example:

"Our task is to see what the questions are that we ought to be facing in the nineteen-sixties (how far away is that decade?). It goes without saying that they are different from what they were in the eighteen-sixties . . . We do not wish to evade the assessment of our work by our contemporaries—we shall welcome it; but we believe we are handling questions that are not likely to receive definitive answers for a long time to come".

This "Cambridge" sub-theology gives voice to an excessive secularist confidence in the temporal future as the time when answers and solutions will be as common as blackberries. I perceive a failure to consider adequately the relationship between the temporal and the eternal. Is it possible that the error has somewhat to do with the failure to reckon with the doctrine of the Ascension? It is the point at which our Lord Jesus Christ entered above the heavens

to exercise His *eternal* Priesthood. Some years ago I was reading a most illuminating paper by the almost certainly martyred Metropolitan Zepticky of the Byzantine Catholic Rite. He was explaining to us western Christians (who are indeed, as western men, over-bothered about time) that when the priest offers Mass the altar is surrounded by countless angels—that it is the throne where the Eternal breaks into the movement we call time and where, among much else, the Ascended Christ as our Eternal Priest offers Himself. It is indeed in the Mass that the Catholic and, for that matter, the Orthodox do after a fashion break through the gyves of time.

But I believe it would not be unjust to Dr. Vidler and to many a liberal or progressive Catholic to say that their attitude hints at an unexamined presupposition in favour of the doctrine of progress as it was made a century ago, when progressivism amounted to a liberal dogma. The idea that “important” theological questions remain to be examined patiently for decade after decade, century after century, while intellectual conviction is suspended according to what I may call the pious doubt to be found in Tennyson’s *In Memoriam*, is not tenable, judged by Christian standards. I must here hedge. I am well aware that “important” is a word overworked these days. Only too often it has about as much use as “brilliant”, “significant” and “remarkable”. I mean by *important*, in matters concerned with the Gospel, what is crucial (and that means “of the Cross”) to the salvation of souls. I dare say that theologians may work on comparatively trivial questions and that there is a development of a dogma where we come to know more about it. It remains that the Faith has not changed since Pentecost.

Peter’s Ship is Afloat and Moving

If I may recur to *Soundings*, I should point out that the title bears reference to a ship in the sort of calm in which those on board may sit comfortably in arm chairs and en-

courage each other to calm speculation and the steady ripening of understanding. There is all the opportunity to take soundings. But the Christian history presents us very seldom with such a state. Peter's ship is afloat; but it rides a storm and sometimes appears to be on the point of sinking. Instead of taking soundings we cry for mercy. The notion that we have a plenitude of years ahead, if the Lord tarry, in which to measure the deep ways of God, reflects the most extraordinary complacency. In contrast, we may rightly see C. S. Lewis' *The Screwtape Letters* as greatly influenced by the years of war. If I may change the metaphor, life is not today—hardly ever was—a steady pilgrimage. Perhaps that is what helps to make *Pilgrim's Progress* read generation after generation. Buchan was evidently steeped in it, judging by his war books.

Life is an emergency. The devil like a roaring lion seeks whom he may devour; and his greatest victory is to persuade so many Christians that he and his legions do not exist. Because of that, "scholarship" will always be at best removed from living in that emergency. In saying so, I do not in any way wish it to be thought that I despise scholarship. Some of the very men I have mentioned, who have seen the emergency, were scholars—T. S. Eliot for example. I would add the name of the Catholic, David Jones. If we take several writers of distinction within the Victorian age as far as Robert Browning, the religious is exploited as a prop to their sanguine secularism. This is not to impugn the value of what they wrote, but to see it in relation to the work of men like Eliot who asserted and still assert the religious not only in its own right but even as an architectonic without which nothing will stand in the long run.

It may be claimed by those who believe that one day we shall know all within the secular order that they are exercising humility, while their opponents are guilty of presumption. The matter stands otherwise. It is the progressives who are presumptuous in that they are certain that a theology of indefinitely extended progress towards truth is based on the assumption that men are going to know more

about God in this life than in fact they are capable of learning. It is not presumptuous to say that even what we have worked out in theological terms is so much straw (to quote what St. Thomas is said to have said about his own *Summa*). It is not presumptuous to bow before the utter mystery and depth of the Godhead.

Perhaps at this point someone may suggest that my criticism implicitly attacks Cardinal Newman's great theory of the development of doctrine. The matter is of great importance since we are given to understand it is probable that a process leading to Newman's beatification will reach completion in 1975. In the first place, Newman steadily set his face against that very liberalism which lies at the back of the "we-shall-know-one-day" pseudo-theology. Again, Newman's theory was one that was consistent with substantial form. An acorn becomes an oak sapling which, if the despoilers leave it alone, will become a great oak tree. The process is completed. We know the truth hidden in the acorn. Let me recur to *The Napoleon of Notting Hill*—that re-readable Introduction. Writes G.K.C. concerning the prophets of his time (and for that matter ours) that they all took the line that if they saw something happening, it would go on and on and on or grow more and more and more and that there was no stopping, whatever it was. On the reasoning, if a piglet arrived with a rather longer nose than his brothers and sisters, it followed that pigs would at last have noses like elephants. And, indeed, what was there to stop the proboscis from growing longer and longer age after age? Such prophets had and have no notion of form

Theology and Faith

But we should meanwhile make as sharp a distinction as possible between the discipline of theology and faith. My faith, thank God, is no different from that of the first martyrs of the Church. The faith of the Catholic Church today has not changed one iota from the faith of the Catholic Church at Pentecost. Catholics and other Christians ought to

grasp with great strength that God has mercifully broken through to man fully and overtly at the physical level in the familiar categories of human existence once and once only. From that breaking through—that revelation and its consequences—has been derived a distinct but limited knowledge of the eternal appropriate to human needs and human capacities. It has been given. We must reject as presumptuous that men of their own skill and search can extend the scope of that knowledge. (I must, of course, not include here some special and private revelation given to those to whom God graciously gives it.) We need a humbler estimate of the range and potentiality of human understanding which, by the action of God's grace, leads us to cling firmly to what God has given man in revelation. It is not that we believe the present formulation of this knowledge is perfect or adequate. We accept the inadequacy; but it is an inadequacy that has to be measured only against the adequacy of the eternal. The inadequacy is a built-in feature of the human situation. The we-shall-know-one-day-pseudo-theologian presupposes that the human understanding will in time (yes, in time) attain more adequate knowledge of God. We should have no such confidence. Does the progressive dare to say he understands the secrets of God better than, say, John Donne? If so, we had better know fast.

For my part, I am sure that I detect in this pseudo-theology the concept of a rectilinear line of human progress, which, at its crudest, one sees in the writings of H. G. Wells. Just before the war, I remember talking to a very "weighty" Quakeress who had been well brought up in the Victorian belief in progress. She told me that she was very greatly disturbed, not just because of the gross evils done by the Nazis in the Third Reich, but by what seemed to her a successful repudiation of the scheme of things she had been brought to take for granted. (She went to Germany and had the courage to speak to Nazis in the authentic Quaker tradition.)

Ourselves and the Future

We do not know about the future. I mean that we do not

know about this line of progress in the future. One easily thinks of the quite extraordinary ratiocinative effort which went on within the Christian community in the autumn of the Roman Empire when one prominent churchman was for teaching Plato and Plotinus to an élite, and an exoteric Christianity—the sort which I call the Faith—to the great mass of ordinary Christians. That was far from uncommon. Then came the great wave of paganism which engulfed Europe save for islands, so to speak, where monks or hermits usually had their spheres of influence. That great Babylon, Rome, where lived about two million souls, in a few centuries was reduced to a population of about six hundred and cattle grazed in the Colloseum. It seems as if the theological controversies practically ceased, so that when St. David called out: “Be joyful and keep the Faith”, he did not mean the Faith against un-faith or heresy or arguing about the Faith. No; the Faith was a package-deal. One had it and one kept it by the grace of God. One did not consider it in relation to the future or some “new theology”. We must see here the consequences of a great revolution. “The World” had gone round full circle. But the Faith stood. The Faith stood vis-a-vis the world revolution as a revolution against the revolution. Christianity demands this revolutionary posture against “the world” But hungry for some revolutionary posture, the pseudo-theologians and their victims seize upon something which, though basically this-worldly in its nature, yet carries with it the emotive current of a challenge to established order. A little sleight of hand with words like freedom and love and person and situation and relationships and the New Morality is born, though that will give place to another New Morality for, in this scheme of things, the rebel is right only at the moment of revolt. We are here upon the edge of another discovery of the character of this pseudo-theology. It is really a trick, a secular trick, in positing a Christianity which is in perpetual revolt against itself, a Christianity which lives by constantly correcting past errors. It has to be repeated that the Christian Faith has about it a supra-temporal changelessness. It has little con-

nection with the unfortunate habit of describing those who know this as "conservative". The doctrine of the Trinity is changeless not because it has stood any test of time but because it is not subject to the test of time. The allowable equations made in the flux of politics are not really applicable to the field of Christian doctrine. The changelessness of Christian truth and practice shows neither a natural toughness against the ravages of time nor an inert moribundity before the vital flow of time. It rather shows a supernatural basis which confers superiority to the effects of the temporal process.

The Faith and the Temporal

The spiritual and moral disciplines of the Faith check the temptation to focus our hopes upon the temporal. Note the conflict. For the secularist the past is dead and all his hope is towards the world's future. For the Christian the past is alive. "If Christ be not risen from the dead . . ." Because of that our hope must be in the eternal. And, notice, to the extent that we by grace are saved by the infinite merits of Christ's death and His destruction of death at a time in history, we already partake in some measure of the eternal; I mean that eternal which enables us now to see through a glass darkly but at length face to face. (It is due to the secular habit that even many Christians think of the beatific vision as imprisoned in the flow of time.) Secularism is enslaved to the future morally and intellectually. And because of that the pseudo-theology of our present is related at a deep level to what amounts to an avaricious impulse discerned in the politics of our time, politics which is a species of bribery, each faction offering us in the next five years (or in some multiple of five) what for the most part our lower natures demand. I contrast this with the politics of my friend, the late Trefor Morgan, a firm nationalist who often stood on a Glamorgan street corner. Once a heckler asked him: "What can you promise me?" In his swift manner Trefor answered, "an early death". He went on to say

that it was a sense of deep patriotism which sent so many of the young few in 1940 to an early death. The heckler muttered: "I've not heard that sort of politics before."

Christianity not for the Current Fashion

I offer another principle. It is that we must accept the present as sufficient to itself. It is in the present that the eternal can in a shadowy way be known. It is in the present that the future can be accepted without hunger, without the outstretched hand clutching at satisfactions which appear to be withheld. We must not be impatient with the present. We must be suspicious of the contemporary—in the sense in which that word is apparently always used, as a part of the flux of things and with the undertone that what is contemporary is just a shade ahead, e.g. "contemporary thought". Somewhere Chesterton wrote that the ghost which does not really exist is the Spirit of the Age. No intellectual tyranny is more confining than that of the *Zeitgeist*. The Christian's proper sense of unity with those who have lived in previous ages is a safeguard against the temptation to slide along on the current of fashion. We live in the light of a continuous historic experience that stretches back to Bethlehem and further to the events recorded in the Old Testament. The Christian cannot take an axe in hand to cut himself off from this tradition without ceasing to be a Christian. His belief is not in the dock against the criteria of contemporary thought. But we must try to be tolerant. Those who call themselves progressive—whether Catholic or Protestant—may believe that the era of the pop singer, the traffic snarl and orbiting hardware is also the age when the fullest realisation of the nature and purpose of the world has been attained. In the best sense of the words, in this the Christian must remain aloof; that is, he must not take as read contemporary thought's notion of the human norm and load on to that as much Christian trimming as that norm's frame can bear; if, indeed, contemporary thought's a priori admiration for current civilisation has left any trimmings unconsigned to the waste-paper basket.

Christianity not for Secularism

Contemporary thought cannot comprehend conversion. What changed Augustine or Paul or Bernard is really not only outside contemporary thought but outside this world. It is this which Christian orthodoxy proclaims. In contrast, the pseudo-theology of liberal "Christianity" represents a fruitless attempt to range the Church upon the side of secularism and, at last, if I must be condemned for being uncharitable, upon the side of the Prince of this world. The attempt will fail. But in failing, it may prove costly in terms of the loss of souls. Among all the ironies of this world not the least of them is this; that the defection of liberal theologians to the banners of secularism should have happened just when liberal civilisation and its rationale have come heavily under judgment in the eyes of those who have represented our modern literary culture at the finest point of its development; and when, if "conservative" be a derogatory description, more and more of us are seeing the need for conservation against the ecological ruin and the pollution of air and water.

Nothing that I have written here should be taken to mean that the Christian should so regard the world in which he lives as to be lacking in what is so essential to the Christian life—joy and inner peace. It has been pointed out that St. John of the Cross, generally regarded as one of the saints who have thrown all away to gain all, had a great love of the beauty of things about him. The Christian sets the highest value upon the natural because he sets an even higher value upon the supernatural. The Christian sees good—what is most salutary—in much of human culture and civilisation because all of it beckons to what is salvific, though, alas, it may become the furniture of Hell.

What follows is a joy to read—because of the concise clarity with which it puts forward the true teaching of the Church concerning contraception, and the confident courage with which Bishop Stewart provides the Faithful of his diocese with essential practical guide-lines in so serious a matter.

A Real Bishop Speaks

DIRECTION TO THE PRIESTS OF THE DIOCESE OF SANDHURST, AUSTRALIA

(Ordered to be read in all the Churches of the Diocese
on October 24, 1974)

1. To be a member of the Catholic Church involves voluntary acceptance, among other doctrines, of the binding force of the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Church. The authority to promulgate those teachings resides exclusively in the Pope, and in the Bishops insofar as they are united with him, for instance, in a properly constituted General Council of the Church.

Once such a doctrinal or moral teaching has been solemnly and authoritatively promulgated, a Catholic may not deny its binding force and remain a Catholic in any serious sense of the term. This is the essential distinction between the Catholic and Protestant positions on the relationship of the authority of the Church to the individual conscience of the Church member.

2. Declarations on these matters by any National Hierarchy, any Bishop, any theologian, any priest have no binding force whatsoever on any Catholic unless they are completely in harmony with the solemn teaching of the Pope or of the Bishops of the world effectively united with the Pope.

3. The teaching of the Church on the matter of artificial contraception goes back to the very foundations of the Church's history. The present Pope, Paul VI, was merely repeating this immemorial teaching when he declared definitively in the Encyclical *Humanae Vitae* that *every act of intercourse must remain open to the transmission of life, that every contraceptive action is intrinsically wrong and always illicit.*

These are strong words, and they represent the clear and authentic teaching of the Church binding on every Catholic.

The Pope repeated this clear and unequivocal teaching as recently as 7th September, 1974, in his address to the Twenty-fifth General Assembly of the International Pharmaceutical Federation.

These statements of the Pope were accepted once again, as they must be, by the Catholic Hierarchy of Australia in the Pastoral Letter issued to every priest in Australia in September, 1974.

4. From this clear, plain and binding teaching of the Popes it follows, for every Catholic conscious of his obligations as a Catholic, that:

(a) No Catholic may use contraceptives for a contraceptive purpose.

(b) It is absolutely unlawful for any priest, privately or publicly, to inform any Catholic that he or she may lawfully use contraceptives with a contraceptive purpose in mind. On the contrary, he has an obligation, especially within the Sacrament of Penance, to assist every Catholic, in honest doubt, to be rightly informed on this question so that he may develop a sound conscience on this subject.

* paragraph (C) included as footnote.

(d) No Catholic pharmacist may sell contraceptive devices for contraceptive purposes.

(e) No Catholic institution, clinic, hospital may prescribe, distribute or apply contraceptives for a contraceptive purpose.

5. Especially in our times, there are not a few cases in

which Catholics have what is known as an "erroneous conscience" on this matter. In exactly the same way, there are Catholics who erroneously but sincerely believe that it is permissible to practise direct sterilisation; to end a marriage by divorce; to commit adultery so long as the persons concerned are "in love"; in certain cases, to destroy the foetus and even to practise euthanasia; to tell clear and gross lies in pursuit of public or private policy; to defraud innocent victims by sharp practices in business or in the Stock Exchange. In all of these cases, some apparently good purpose is regarded as providing over-riding justification.

The Church acknowledges that where a person is sincerely in error in these or other matters, his or her own degree of subjective guilt is diminished. In some such cases, there may even be no subjective guilt at all. Nevertheless that person's conviction, however sincere, is objectively erroneous.

✓ The responsibility of the priest is to bring that person from an erroneous opinion to acceptance of true teaching.

6. Those who are not Catholics may perhaps understand the position of the Church on these matters by considering the analogy of the international law, established or declared by the Nuremberg Trials. Many defendants were adjudged as guilty of objective crime by the Nuremberg Tribunal even though their illicit actions were undertaken in the conscientious belief that they were bound to obey superior orders. The Nuremberg Tribunal did not accept this sincere and conscientious belief as a valid defence against acts which were objectively illicit because, in its view, these acts were against the law of man's nature.

The Church is more merciful than the Nuremberg Tribunal. It accepts the position that sincere belief in an erroneous proposition removes a person's own subjective guilt, even though the act committed objectively remains a sin or a crime.

BERNARD D. STEWART, Bishop of Sandhurst.

(C) No Catholic doctor may prescribe contraceptives for a contraceptive purpose.

CHRISTIAN ORDER, JULY, 1975

Budget for a Crisis

J. M. JACKSON

THE problem facing the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he introduced his April budget was a combination of rapid inflation and rising unemployment. Either alone could be regarded as a serious problem requiring urgent attention. Taken together, they constitute an almost impossible task. The measures that a Chancellor would normally take to curb inflation are likely to make unemployment worse, whilst measures to reduce unemployment are likely to make inflation worse. If this is the case, the Chancellor clearly had to choose between tackling inflation and tackling unemployment. Which should he have regarded as the greater evil? He chose inflation.

It is tempting to argue that it is people who matter most, and that unemployment is an intolerable evil. There is no denying that unemployment is a very real evil, that it entails very real hardships for the worker and his family. Not least of these is the fact that the worker is denied the opportunity to play a useful role in the economic life of society. Nevertheless, this does not mean that it is necessarily wrong to pursue economic policies that may result in an increase in unemployment. In the present situation, it is not even a simple choice between curbing inflation and allowing unemployment to rise. Allowing inflation to continue at the present rate may itself create a situation in which unemployment will rise anyway. The choice therefore may lie between unemployment with inflation and unemployment without inflation. If that is the choice, unemployment without inflation is obviously the lesser evil.

The Consequences of Inflation

For most people, inflation presents itself in terms of

trying to make ends meet when prices keep going up week after week. When prices are rising at something like 5 per cent a year we hardly notice the process. After a few years, prices might, if we stopped to think, appear significantly higher in the past. When, however, inflation reaches 15 or 20 per cent, the situation is quite different. Scarcely a week passes without a substantial increase in the price of some item we purchase regularly. Wages may still, in the long run, keep pace with inflation, but if wages are adjusted only annually, or even twice a year, the rise in prices is sufficient for people to feel significantly worse off at the end of a six or twelve month period than they were at the beginning.

This is not the most serious aspect of inflation. The most serious aspect, domestically, is the extent to which rapid inflation makes provision for the future extremely difficult. This was examined in some detail in my April article, 'The Pace of Inflation'. It becomes virtually impossible to fix pension contributions that will enable a person to obtain the kind of pension that the best occupational schemes have provided, namely something like two-thirds of salary at the time of retirement. In any case, the sudden increase in the rate of inflation makes calculation of the necessary contributions extremely difficult. Moreover, where a man has been in a scheme for say ten years and contributions have been based on a certain expected rate of inflation (perhaps 5 per cent a year) and a corresponding salary by the time he retires and inflation then increases, his salary at retirement may increase astronomically. * The contributions in the past will not have been adequate and the pension fund will have a deficit. There is a real danger that rapid inflation will totally undermine private provision for the future and reduce everyone to utter dependence upon State provision.

* The word astronomically has not been used lightly. If inflation is at the rate of 5 per cent a year, a man starting his career might see someone retiring in the kind of job he would eventually get with a salary of £1,000. He himself might retire in forty years at a salary of £6,700. If inflation were at the rate of 15 per cent a year, he might retire at a salary of £232,000!

Inflation also has serious external dangers. In his budget speech the Chancellor stressed that the rate of inflation in Britain is now decidedly faster than in other countries. Immediately after the drastic raising of oil prices, all countries experienced severe inflation, aggravated by some increases in other raw material prices. Now these other countries have brought inflation under control while in this country the signs are that it is getting worse. There are two dangers. First, that with our prices rising we will make our exports uncompetitive. This means we will sell fewer exports and the balance of payments will deteriorate. It is already between £3,500 and £4,000 million. At present we are maintaining our standard of living because the people from whom we buy are willing to lend back to us what we owe rather than demand payment. They cannot be expected to do this indefinitely. Especially if they see prices here continuing to spiral, and the value of the pound on the foreign exchange market falling so that the value of their funds here is steadily declining in real terms.

The Causes of Inflation

Inflation may have its origins in either demand or in the costs of production. If demand is excessive, that is if there is a demand for more goods and services than are being produced, the effect is to bid up prices. Demand may be excessive because people are drawing on past savings and spending these as well as their current incomes or because the government or business men are borrowing money newly created by the banks, and adding this to the demand created by money already in circulation.* The other explanation of inflation lies in rising costs. When the Arab countries quadrupled the price of oil this naturally led to a sharp increase in most goods and services. The cost of generating electricity from oil increased, the cost of fuel oil used in

* When people draw on past savings, it may be a necessary part of the mechanism that new money is created by the banks. Alternatively, the money that is in existence may have to circulate faster.

industry increased, the cost of plastics which are made from oil increased, and of course the cost of petrol for road transport increased.

At the present time, however, there is little doubt that the main cause of inflation is wage costs. Wages are increasing at rates which are totally unrealistic. Inflation is currently running at something like 20 per cent a year. Many wage claims, on the other hand, are substantially greater than this. Thirty per cent seems relatively modest, at least among those claims that make the headlines. The social contract implies that workers should normally be compensated, but no more than this, for rises in the cost of living. This is ridiculously over-generous. The simple fact of our economic situation is that we are importing about £70 a year more than we export for every man, woman and child in the country. There can be no solution without the acceptance of a lower standard of living. We may export more or import less, or some combination of the two. Whichever we do, there must be fewer goods and services left for our own domestic use. If we do not see and act upon the necessity for accepting this lowering of our material standards we will continue our present course until we are faced with financial failure. A time will come when foreigners will stop lending us the money we need to pay for our imports: with the value of the pound falling, they may withdraw the loans they have already made and make our position critical. Then we will be forced to curb imports so drastically that raw materials are scarce and unemployment will be on a scale far in excess of anything we have envisaged in recent years.

The Budget

The budget is clearly designed to curb domestic spending. The government is going to take more money from us in income tax and in taxes on luxury items (electrical goods and the like which now carry 25 per cent VAT instead of 8 per cent), alcohol, cars, and cigarettes. Having paid out additional money in tax, we will have less to spend gener-

ally, and the Chancellor hopes, no doubt, that a substantial part of our cut in expenditure will be made on imported goods. In so far as we reduce our spending on home produced goods, the hope is that this will lead to output being diverted to the export market.

The Chancellor also spoke of reduced government expenditure. There may be some reduction in real expenditure, that is on items like defence that will leave resources unused and potentially available for use in export industries. The major cuts in government expenditure, however, appear to be in subsidies of various kinds. This means that ordinary individuals will have to pay more for their housing or food or for the products of nationalised coal, electricity and gas undertakings, for nationalised rail and air transport and so on. The effect of this is to take the money out of their pockets in the same way as taxation.

The immediate effect of the budget is likely to be a reduction in demand, and this in turn is likely to lead to a reduction in the level of employment. If, as the budget measures begin to bite, it proves possible to increase exports, there need be no rise in unemployment; and indeed the present upward trend could be reversed. Achievement of the higher levels of exports depends upon two things: a real sales effort by British firms and bringing inflation under control so that we can compete on price.

Will the Mixture Work?

Has the Chancellor taken the right kind of measures? Has the right amount of money been taken out of the economy? The second of these questions is the more difficult to answer. It is always extremely difficult to make the kind of calculation that is necessary to answer this question, and even if the measures appear right at the time there is always the danger that circumstances will change before very long. For the most part, it is reasonable to assume that the government has resources for making the necessary calculations and access to information which give them a

better chance of getting things right than the ordinary individual. What is perhaps far more worrying is whether the right kind of measures have been taken.

The Chancellor himself attributes our current inflation to excessive wage demands. In that, he is probably correct. The measures he has introduced, however, are just those that he would have had to take if inflation had been brought about by an excessive level of demand. Are these measures going to result in a check to wage inflation? This is by no means certain. There is a good chance that, initially at least, they will have some impact on the balance of payments. It has been argued above that with falling domestic incomes, imports will decline, and that firms who find demand falling on the home market may be stimulated into increasing their export trade. Such developments would contribute to improving the balance of payments situation. They would at least help to stop rising money incomes drawing in greater volumes of imports. They do not, however, do anything directly to prevent unions continuing to press unreasonable wage demands. There is, indeed, a real danger that the unions will press further wage demands because the budget has increased the cost of living.

Many workers are entitled under agreements to wage increases when the cost of living rises. Most expect increases which will compensate for the rise in the cost of living during the period since their last increase. If this principle is accepted, it is nonsense for the Chancellor to try to reduce demand by increasing indirect taxation or cutting subsidies. If workers are allowed to get wage increases that match the rise in the cost of living (brought about in this case by increased taxation and reduced subsidies) they can continue to maintain their existing standard of consumption. Firms can only maintain the existing level of employment, however, if they can find the cash to pay the higher wages. It may seem that they can do this if they are allowed to raise prices. In the present situation, price controls may prevent this. Even in the absence of price controls, however, there may be difficulties. Everyone, or at least most people, may be getting

wage increases. This may suggest that they will be willing to pay the higher prices. What must be remembered, is that firms may have to pay out the higher wages before they are able to sell at the higher prices. This can only be done if they have cash or other liquid assets available, or if they can borrow from the banks. If they are faced with rising wages at a time when they are short of cash and the banks are prevented by government policy from lending, they are in trouble. Firms may have to curtail their activities and lay off workers, or some may be forced into liquidation. In other words, unemployment will increase, and a limited section of the public will be forced to bear the brunt of the overall reduction in demand.

If inflation is caused by rising wages, the remedy surely is to act directly on wage levels. Certainly it is preferable to rely upon a voluntary incomes policy, provided it works. It can equally be argued that statutory policies have not in the past worked particularly well. Experience of the social contract to date suggests that a voluntary policy does not work. If some groups break the guidelines, it means that those who keep to them find their pay is falling behind. Moreover, if the overall increase in wages is excessive and the government is forced to adopt the kind of policy the Chancellor has now introduced they are penalised along with those whose irresponsible behaviour has brought about the need to increase taxation. The government has an overriding duty to maintain equity between wage-earner and wage-earner and not permit this kind of situation to develop. If the trade unions are not prepared to accept a statutory incomes policy that is acceptable to the majority of citizens in this country, there can be only one conclusion: that the present system of collective bargaining with free trade unions is incompatible with democratic government. If so, there must be a drastic reconsideration of the permissible role of the trade unions in our society.

Do you think it is part of Communist policy to ruin the morals of their opponents? Is it not contrary to right order for God to become man? Is it just that hospital staff should object to private patients?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Do you think it is part of Communist policy to ruin the morals of their opponents?

If they are faithful in their policy to Lenin's plan, then they are certainly working to demoralize the Anti-Communist Countries. Lenin said (he is quoted in John D. Sheridan's inspiring book, *The Hungry Sheep*): "We will seduce the youth of the West by sex and drugs." Anyone who still respects our Catholic moral standards must be appalled by the corruption that follows abandonment of them. It is impossible to say how much of that degradation is due to Communist promotion of pornography and drug-taking (though it seems clear that hard drugs were made easily available to the American forces in Vietnam by their enemies). It could be that the West's own permissiveness is now doing the Communists' work for them. The Responsible Society (28 Portland Place, London, W.1.) has recently published a pamphlet, "Entertainment or Exploitation?", by Joanna Nash. It is a critical survey of girls' teenage magazines. Parents and teachers should know the influences to which teenage girls are subject—influences which help to make a society with no moral principles and no way of life worth defending. The pamphlet costs 10p, and can be had either from The Responsible Society or from Miss Nash, 2 Redford Avenue, Wallington, Surrey. It could serve very well as a basis for discussion in

Sixth Forms or Youth Clubs. There is another excellent pamphlet, "But where is Love?" by Venetia Riches, also available from the Responsible Society.

Is it not contrary to right order for God to become man?

I think a number of the more notable heretics would agree with your general sentiment before going on to formulate their precise errors. For many, in Our Lord's own time and in every succeeding age, the Incarnation of God is unbelievable. "The Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God" (J.5. 18). The Adoptionists at the end of the second century said that Christ was just a man, but raised to the highest human goodness by being "adopted" by God. Arius said that Christ was no more than a creature of God, though elevated above all other creatures. Later heretics denied the full humanity of Christ, or they held that He was two persons, or that His human nature had disappeared, completely absorbed by the divine. In our own day there are so-called Christians or Catholics who deny the divinity of Christ. It is plain to see that the doctrine that God became man is hard to accept.

It can be accepted only by faith. It is a mystery of faith, and even when we know it as a fact we cannot comprehend it. Your concern for "right order" is understandable; but it is God's order and not ours, and we should start from the truth that whatever God does is bound to be in order. "Who shall know the mind of God?" Or who hath been his counsellor? Whom did He consult for his enlightenment, who taught him knowledge, and showed him the way of understanding?" For us, God cannot be other than mystery, as One, as Three in One, as the Word made flesh, born of the Virgin Mary, as the Real Presence of the Holy Eucharist, Sacrifice and Sacrament; but we know that infinite mystery by His loving self-revelation, and it is by faith that we know.

Is it just that hospital staff should object to the admission of private patients?

Before venturing on a judgment, I should need to know far more about the grounds for the objection.

If the admission of a private patient is to a National Health Service hospital, it could be that objectors feel that superior wealth has enabled the patient to jump the queue, which, as everybody knows, is long. The poorer patients are thus made to be under-privileged. What the force of that objection is I just don't know, as I have no idea how physicians and surgeons decide their priorities. What is clear is that the Health Service, which was started with the laudable intention that no one in need of medical help should be denied it, has become a stalking-horse for extreme socialists. No enterprise must be private. All must be directed by an omniscient State. As with education, so with industry and so with medicine—the State must be the sole Employer, and must define ideals and decide policies. In theory, every citizen will have an equal right to the best of ideals, policies and service; but practice is bound to fall short of theory. To begin with, socialism's understanding of equality leads to egalitarianism, which is unable to reconcile equality with difference, as each of us has to do in his own person. Extreme socialism subjects the skill of specialists in education, medicine and other fields to the requirements of bureaucratic control, and it denies people the right to run their own lives. It will not let them spend their own money as they like. They may not buy medical insurance and be treated privately.

Correction

Fr. Lawson apologizes to all who read his erroneous 'Answer' in the May number. The angels and saints are still in the Confiteor, and Our Lady does have her place in the second Eucharistic Prayer.

Book Reviews

The Everlasting Man by G. K. Chesterton; Burns & Oates, £2.75; pp.274.

A Nash Omnibus by Father Robert Nash, S.J.; John S. Burns & Sons, Glasgow, £1.75; pp.201.

The Church is facing enemies within and without. It is right that her friends do battle for her and for the Faith which She guards. We have good historians and theologians who tackle marauders and force them to show their true colours. Their articles, and reviews of their books, have often appeared in *Christian Order*. There are, besides, admirably full and straightforward expositions of the Church's truth, for example, Fr. Ripley's *This is the Faith*. We now have, fifty years after its first publication, G. K. Chesterton's *The Everlasting Man*, which combines, in Chesterton's inimitable style, the unmasking of imposters and the illumination of doctrine. Chesterton, as he says himself, was no specialist in theology, history or the natural sciences; but he was remarkably well informed in all those fields, and he had an incisive and sturdy common sense—common sense which he calls "the instinct for the probable".

The book is about man and God-made-man. "I maintain that when brought out into the daylight two things look altogether strange and unique; and that it is only in the false twilight of an imaginary period of transition that they can be made to look in the least like anything else. The first of these is the creature called man and the second is the man called Christ." It is refreshment for mind and heart to see Chesterton slashing away the stupidities and the sophistries in "the loose evolutionism of current culture". Man's "body may have evolved from the brutes; but we know nothing of any such transition that throws the smallest light upon his soul as it has shown itself in history". "The more we really look at man as an animal, the less he will look like one".

Man is a person, and we never know him as anything else but person. He is to be beheld with wonderment because he is "the measure of all things and the image of God". Chesterton, with that noble concept of man, proceeds to cut away and discard the demeaning theories which would derive civilisation and religion from roots growing in a morass of ignorance and superstition. Civilisation and religion are natural to man. They are the work of the spirit, of man's awareness of himself and his needs, of his self-sufficiency and dependence. They start from the goodness that is in man, and then they decay, into tyrannies and mythologies and devil-worship, because man is not good enough.

And so we come to "the man called Christ"—or, rather, He comes to us. The gods of paganism were all dead, and man was dying and doomed. To save him, the Word of God, the author of all that is, its beginning and its end, became man. Man, when he first appears, is a reality entirely new. When the man called Christ appears, He is a reality new and unique. He is "the carpenter's apprentice who said calmly and almost carelessly, like one looking over his shoulder: 'Before Abraham was, I am'". What the book asks us to do is to read the story of Christ. "The grinding power of the plain words of the Gospel story is like the power of mill-stones; and those who can read them simply enough will feel as if rocks had been rolled upon them". The newness of Christ fills the universe. "On the third day the friends of Christ coming at daybreak to the place found the grave empty and the stone rolled away. In varying ways they realised the new wonder; but even they hardly realised that the world had died in the night. What they were looking at was the first day of a new creation, with a new heaven and a new earth; and in a semblance of the gardener God walked again in the garden, in the cool not of the evening but the dawn".

Resurrection belongs also to the Body of Christ, the Church. "It was supposed to have been withered up at last in the dry light of the Age of Reason; it was supposed to have disappeared ultimately in the earthquake of the Age of

Revolution. Science explained it away; and it was still there. History disinterred it in the past; and it appeared suddenly in the future. Today it stands once more in our path; and even as we watch it, it grows". "We might sometimes fancy that the Church grows younger as the world grows old".

The dust cover of Father Nash's book tells us that "as a writer he does not pretend to be a Chesterton". What writer would make so foolish a claim! But Father Nash is himself. He has his own style, recognizable and welcome. And he shares with Chesterton that "joy in the Lord" and that "hope of our calling" which shine in *A Nash Omnibus* as in *The Everlasting Man*. The *Omnibus* is filled with what might be called "occasional papers" but which have the permanence of Christ's Good News which they proclaim. It is enriching and restful to have our life of divine grace—prayer, the sacraments, priesthood, love—explained to us and exemplified for us once more, and to receive help in living that life from Father Nash's practice and priestly experience. Both books have the hopefulness which is founded on Christ; and both are books for our time.

William Lawson, S.J.

Additional copies of *Taize 1974*, by Joanna Nash, *Christian Order*, are available from APPROACHES, Casa Garcia Moreno, 1, Waverley Place, Saltcoats, KA21 5AX, Scotland.

5 copies for 20p (50c) post free.

15 copies for 40p (\$1.00) post free.